



435321

To: Patricia Flores/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc: Debra Rossi/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
subject: Re: Maryland Sand Gravel & Stone Indoor Air Modeling Results

Hi, Pat: I completed the calculations for the soil-to-indoor air modeling performed for the MSGG site. Due to time constraints, I focused on the compounds that appear to be driving inhalation risks, per model projections. To account for additivity, I defined the risk drivers as compounds with an excess cancer risk of  $1E-05$  (or greater) or an HQ of 0.1 (or greater):

**1,1-Dichloroethene:** cancer risk =  $4.1E-04$  at Pond 2  
cancer risk =  $1.2E-05$  at the Soil Piles

**Benzene:** cancer risk =  $2.4E-05$  at Pond 2

**Chlorobenzene:** HQ = 0.69 at Pond 2  
HQ = 1.5 at the Soil Piles  
HQ = 0.30 at the Soil Staging Area

**cis-1,2-Dichloroethene:** HQ = 1.7 at the Soil Piles  
HQ = 0.23 at the Soil Staging Area

**Vinyl Chloride:** cancer risk =  $4.7E-05$  at the Soil Piles  
HQ = 0.25 at the Soil Piles

In this regard, I checked the exposure input parameters (averaging time, exposure frequency, and exposure duration) and the toxicity criteria (Unit Risk Factors for carcinogens and Reference Concentrations for non-carcinogens) applied by the model for the predictions of risk, and have the following comments to offer:

- All of the exposure input parameters are appropriate.
- The Unit Risk Factors for 1,1-dichloroethene and benzene are accurate, as is the Reference Concentration for vinyl chloride.
- The Unit Risk Factor used by the model for vinyl chloride ( $4.4E-06$  ug/m<sup>3</sup>) represents the value suggested for a continuous lifetime exposure during adulthood. In the case of this site and related exposures under a residential scenario, the Unit Risk Factor recommended for continuous lifetime exposure from birth ( $8.8E-06$  ug/m<sup>3</sup>) is more appropriate. Application of the more stringent Unit Risk Factor for vinyl chloride would approximately double the excess cancer risk predicted by the model for this compound.
- The Reference Concentration used in the model for chlorobenzene ( $2E-02$  mg/m<sup>3</sup>) appears to be incorrect. The Reference Concentration recommended by NCEA for this compound is  $6E-02$  mg/m<sup>3</sup>. Use of the NCEA-generated criterion would serve to reduce predicted HQ values by approximately a factor of three.
- I could not verify the Reference Concentration used by the model for cis-1,2-dichloroethene ( $3.5E-02$  mg/m<sup>3</sup>). To my knowledge, based on a paper produced in 1993 by NCEA, a Reference Concentration could not be derived for this chemical.

That's it. I expect to review the draft Proposed Plan for this site within the next week or two. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thanks.